



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/601,741

06/23/2003

Bryan T. Starbuck

MSFTP438US

9003

27195

7590

03/05/2008

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER  
1900 EAST NINTH STREET  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/05/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/601,741	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STARBUCK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DJENANE M. BAYARD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2141	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DJENANE M. BAYARD. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) David Noonan. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: Budford et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the 101 rejection and the prior art of Budford et al. Applicant's representative argues that Budford does not disclose or suggest combining features into useful pairs evaluated for consistency to determine spam.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Djenane M Bayard/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2141

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required